2nd March 1929]

A.—G.O. No. 54 I., dated 9th January 1929, [a] is laid on the table. Items (2), (3) and (4) referred to in the Government Order will be investigated by a special subdivision sanctioned for the purpose.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA:—"May I know when this committee will commence its operations?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"I believe it is working now."

Repairs to tanks in the East Godavari Agency damaged by heavy rains.

* 1634 *Q.*—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of tanks that were damaged in East Godavari during the current financial year on account of heavy rains;

(*b*) the probable cost of such damages; and

(*c*) whether any and, if so, what provision for repairs has been made in the budget for 1929–30?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to Part II of the papers on "Floods—Vizagapatam and East Godavari—October 1928" which have already been placed on the Council Table. The cost of repairing the damages caused to the Public Works Department works has not been reported. The Superintending Engineer has, however, reported that steps have been taken to carry out all urgent works wherever necessary.

(*c*) There is no separate provision in the budget for meeting the cost of flood damages. It is included in the lump allotment for "Maintenance and repairs"

Re-examination of the Gundalakama scheme.

* 1635 *Q.*—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the re-examination of the Gundalakama scheme by the Chief Engineer referred to in the answer to question No. 662, answered on 26th November 1928, has been completed; and

(*b*) if not, at what stage the same is at present?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The estimate for the scheme is under scrutiny by the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) who expects to submit it to Government about the middle of March 1929.

Alleged grievances of owners of lands below the Vellalore tank in Coimbatore taluk.

* 1636 *Q.*—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the owners of lands below the Vellalore tank in Coimbatore taluk complained that the owners of lands above the tank were taking practically the whole water coming in the channel and that therefore they had to suffer much loss;

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 458–459 infra.

(b) whether the authorities of the Revenue and Public Works (Irrigation) Departments enquired into the matter and found that the complaints were based on facts;

(c) whether the authorities recommended that all the sluices in the channel above the tank should have screw doors and wanted the owners of the lands below the tank to contribute the whole cost;

(d) whether the cost so required has been fully paid up and, if so, when and how much;

(e) whether the doors have not yet been put up and, if so, why; and

(f) when the Government intend to put up the doors and what compensation the Government propose to pay to the land-owners for the delay and for the money remaining with the Government all the time?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government understand that the local officers received such a complaint and enquired into the matter, but the Government have no information as to the actual facts.

(c) Yes.

(d) A sum of Rs. 760 is reported to have been paid by the ryots in March 1927.

(e) On account of a change in the personnel of the section and the Subdivisional officers just at the time of the closure of the channel, it is reported that the work could not be put in hand at once.

(f) The Executive Engineer reports that the work has since been put in hand. As regards the latter part of this clause Government do not admit any liability. So far as Government is aware no claim has been made on this ground.

Landlord and Tenant

Dismissal of suits under the Estates Land Act by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chatrapur.

* 1637 *Q.*—Mr. D. Narayana Raju: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of suits and petitions under the Estates Land Act of 1908 decreed ex parte or dismissed for default by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chatrapur, Ganjam district, within the six months ending with November 1928;

(b) whether there were any complaints against the said officer that he is abusing parties especially the zamindari ryots;

(c) whether there was any resolution of the Berhampur Bar bearing on the said officer's discourtesy to its members; and

(d) the action taken on these representations?

A.—(a) Two hundred and eighty-two suits were decreed ex parte. Eleven suits and 13 petitions were dismissed for default of appearance of the plaintiff and the petitioner.

(b) A petition was received by the Board of Revenue containing such allegations but no action was taken as the petition was unsigned.

(c) & (d) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (d) of question No. 1466.